



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/350,467 07/09/199 | | 7/09/1999 | JOHN PAYNE | 154143-0017 | 8175 | |
| 20594 | 7590 | 04/24/2002 | | | | |
| CHRISTOP | | | EXAMINER | | | |
| AKIN, GUM P O BOX 688 | - | JSS, HAUER & | CALDWELL, ANDREW T | | | |
| DALLAS, TX | 75313- | 0688 | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| | | • | | 2154 | 7 | |
| | | | | DATE MAILED: 04/24/2002 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

ļΛ

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/350,467 Applicant(s)

Examiner

Art Unit

2154

Payne et al.

Andrew Caldwell

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.

| co - Failur - Any | o period for reply is specified above, the mommunication. The to reply within the set or extended perior is the control of th | od for rep e month: | oly will, by statut s after the mailin | e, cause the appli | cation to become A | ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | |
|-------------------------|--|------------------------|--|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| Status | | | | | | | |
| 1) 🔀 | Responsive to communication(s) fil | ed on <u>F</u> | eb 7, 2000 | | | | |
| 2a) 🗌 | This action is FINAL. | 2b) 💢 | This action is | non-final. | | | |
| 3) 🗆 | Since this application is in condition closed in accordance with the practice. | | | | | | |
| Disposi | ition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4) 💢 | Claim(s) <u>1-178</u> | | | | is/are | pending in the application. | |
| 4 | 4a) Of the above, claim(s) | | | | is/are | withdrawn from consideratio | |
| 5) 🗌 | Claim(s) | | | | i | s/are allowed. | |
| 6) 💢 | Claim(s) <u>1-178</u> | | | | i | s/are rejected. | |
| 7) 🗆 | Claim(s) | | | | | | |
| 8) 🗆 | Claims | | | | | | |
| 9) 💢 10) 🗆 | The granded described on | | is/are obje | | | | |
| 11)□ 12)□ | The proposed drawing correction f The oath or declaration is objected | _ | | is: a⊥ | approved b | disapproved. | |
| 13)□ a)□ | under 35 U.S.C. § 119 Acknowledgement is made of a cla All b) □ Some* c) □ None of a cla 1. □ Certified copies of the priority 2. □ Certified copies of the priority | of: docum | ents have bee | n received. | | | |
| | 3. Copies of the certified copies application from the In ee the attached detailed Office action Acknowledgement is made of a classical control of the control of the certified copies. | of the p ternation | oriority docume onal Bureau (PC list of the cert | ents have been CT Rule 17.2(a) fied copies not | received in this). received. | | |
| Attachm | ent(s) | | | | | | |
| 15) 💢 N | otice of References Cited (PTO-892) | | 18) | 18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). | | | |
| 16) 💢 N | otice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT | O-948) | Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) | | | | |
| 17) 💢 In | formation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Pag | er No(s) | <i>3</i> 20) □ | Other: | | | |

Art Unit: 2154

Part III DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

Claims 1-178 are presented for examination. 1.

Response to Preliminary Amendment

2. The preliminary amendment (paper no. 2) filed on July 9, 1999 has been entered. The specification includes claims 1-81. The amendment adds new claims 178-256. The Applicants then filed a preliminary amendment (paper no. 4) filed on February 7, 2000 adding claims 257-274. Accordingly, there is a gap in the claim numbering between claims 81 and 178. Applicants must number additional claims consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claim previously presented. C.F.R. 1.126. Pursuant to the rule, the Examiner has renumbered claims 178-274 as claims 82-178. Attached to this Office action is a marked up copy of the amendment showing how the claims were renumbered. A complete response to this Office action must include amendments to claims 82-178 changing the dependencies within the claims.

Serial Number: 09/350,467 Art Unit: 2154

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement filed on July 9, 1999 (paper no. 3 was considered in part. The reference to Motorola dated July 24, 1995 (second non-patent reference on sheet 2/7) fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each U.S. and foreign patent; each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. Accordingly, the IDS has been considered in part.

Specification

4. The specification is objected to under 37 CFR 1.71(a) for failing to failing to provide an adequate written description of the subject matter of claims 64-81 and 141-158. Claims 64-81 and 141-158 are written in means plus function form. The Applicant must amend the specification to state for each and every means plus function limitation in the claims the corresponding structure, material or acts to perform the recited function. Under certain limited circumstances, the written description does not have to explicitly describe the structure corresponding to a means-plus-function limitation to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. See Supplemental Examination Guidelines for Claims Subject to 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 6, 1236 O.G.

Art Unit: 2154

98, 101. However, the Guidelines state, that in the situation such as this one, where the written description only implicitly or inherently sets forth structure corresponding to a means plus function, the Examiner may require the applicant to clarify the record by amending the written description such that it expressly recites what structure performs the recited function. Id. at 102.

Claim Objections

- 5. The claims are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(f) for failing to be numbered consecutively. There are two claim 9's. The Applicants should submit an amendment that removes text corresponding to the second claim 9. Please note that the second claim 9 corresponds to claim 159, which was added in the preliminary amendment filed on July 9, 1999. and add new claim 104, corresponding to the second claim 9.
- 6. Claim 53 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as an improper dependent claim since it does not further limit a preceding claim. Claim 53 depends on claim 54. For purposes of prior art rejections in this Office action, claim 53 will be construed as depending on claim 37.
- 7. Claims 82-159 are objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(b) because they do not substantially differ from claims 1-50, 56-81,

4

Art Unit: 2154

and 91. As to claims 82-158, they are duplicates of claims 1-50 and 56-81, respectively. As to claim 159, it is a duplicate of claim 91.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 9. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

<u>'958 v. Ammons and '721</u>

10. Claims 1-3, 14-25, 29-36, 44, 49-50, 60-66, 78-84, 96-107, 111-118, 126, 131-132, 137-143, 153-158, 161-178 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCoy et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,790,958, in view of Ammons, B., "RBDS for Your Station!" http://www.crlsystems.com/crl/tech/rbds.htm, Circuit

Art Unit: 2154

Research Labs, Inc., pp. 1-13, Sep. 1995, and May, U.S. Patent No. 5,043,721. In this Office action, any apparatus claim will be discussed before its corresponding method claim, even though the method claims numerically precede the apparatus claims.

Since claims 82-84, 96-107, 111-118, 126, 131-132, 137-143, and 153-158 are duplicate claims as discussed above, separate reasons for rejection will not be given.

Claims 64-66 and 78-81:

- 11. Regarding claim 64, the preamble will be given patentable weight since the claim body refers back to the preamble. McCoy teaches the invention substantially as claimed by disclosing a data transmission system comprising:
 - a. Remote computing devices (Fig. 1 elem. 20);
- b. Means for transmitting preprocessed data at said central broadcast server (Fig. 1 elem. 44);
- c. Means for instantaneously notifying said computing devices of receipt of said preprocessed data (Col. 2 lines 51-62).
- 12. McCoy does not teach a system comprising:
- a. Means for transmitting data from an information source to a central broadcast server;
- b. Means for preprocessing said data at said central broadcast server;

Art Unit: 2154

7

- c. Wherein said remote computing devices are notified of receipt of said preprocessed data whether said computing devices are on or off.
- 13. Ammons on the other hand discloses a system comprising:
- a. Means for transmitting data from an information source to a central broadcast server (p. 2 FM radio station transmitter):
- b. Means for preprocessing said data at said central broadcast server (p. 2 RBDS generator).
- 14. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Ammon's system for preprocessing data from an information server and broadcasting the data to remote computing devices with the radio reception system of McCoy based upon McCoy's explicit teaching that the broadcast signal is encoded and decoded according to the RBDS standard (Col. 1 lines 25-39).
- 15. May on the other hand teaches means for notifying said computing devices wherein said remote computing devices are notified of receipt of said preprocessed data whether said computing devices are on or off (Fig. 2; Col. 3 lines 61-68).
- 16. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine May's system for waking up the remote computing device upon the receipt of

data with McCoy's remote computing device because it reduces the amount of power consumed by the remote computing.

- 17. Regarding claim 65, McCoy teaches means for wirelessly transmitting said preprocessed data to remote receivers (Fig. 1).
- 18. Regarding claim 66, McCoy teaches means for transmitting said preprocessed data using a paging network (Col. 1 lines 58-67; Col. 2 lines 50-62).
- 19. Regarding claim 78, McCoy teaches a system comprising alert means which when activated allows display of data (Fig. 7 elem. 306).
- 20. Regarding claim 79, Ammons teaches means for sending data on groups of pooled capcodes (pp. 7-9 nonpublic messages).
- 21. Regarding claim 80, Ammons teaches means for multiplexing data over multiple capcodes to be reassembled at said user as if data were sent over a single capcode (pp. 7-9 nonpublic messages).
- 22. Regarding claim 81, Ammons teaches means for assigning, transmitting, receiving, and combining (pp. 7-9 nonpublic messages).

Claims 1-3, 14-25, 29-36, 44, 49-50, 60-63:

23. Regarding claims 1-3, 14, and 61-63, they are method claims corresponding to apparatus claims 64-66 and 78-81. Since they do not teach or define above the information in the corresponding

Art Unit: 2154

apparatus claims, they are rejected under the same basis. The claims correspond as follows: 1 with 64, 2 with 65, 3 with 66, 14 with 78, 61 with 79, 62 with 80, and 63 with 81.

- 24. Regarding claim 14, McCoy teaches a method comprising providing alert means which when activated allows display of data (Fig. 7 elem. 306).
- 25. Regarding claim 15, McCoy teaches a method wherein said alert means comprises a visual alert (Fig. 7 elem. 306).
- 26. Regarding claim 16, McCoy teaches a method wherein said alert means comprises a audio alert (Fig. 7 elem. 306).
- 27. Regarding claim 17, McCoy teaches a method comprising providing a dockable user interface alert panel on a display communicating with computing device for providing alerts to said user, wherein said alert panel is dockable on top of other applications (Col. 14 line 56 to Col. 15 line 13).
- 28. Regarding claim 18, McCoy teaches a method comprising displaying fly-in graphics and icon buttons to alert said user that new data has been received by said computing device (Col. 14 line 56 to Col. 15 line 13).
- 29. Regarding claim 19, McCoy teaches a method wherein said alerts reflect type of information present at computing device (Col. 14 line 56 to Col. 15 line 13).

Art Unit: 2154

- 30. Regarding claim 20, Ammons teaches deriving redundant packets for transmission to said user (p. 7).
- 31. Regarding claim 21, McCoy teaches parceling a data block into one incoming message, parceling said messages into k packets, and computing a CRC (Fig. 6).
- 32. Regarding claim 22, McCoy teaches a method wherein packets include information and parity portions (Fig. 2).
- 33. Regarding claim 23, McCoy teaches a method comprising performing error correction and detection on said code words after said data packets have been parceled (Cols. 10-11).
- 34. Regarding claim 24, McCoy teaches a method comprising assembling a data block from said code words (Cols. 10-11).
- 35. Regarding claim 25, McCoy teaches the steps of counting, determining, saving, discarding, and assembling (Cols. 10-12).
- 36. Regarding claim 29, official notice is hereby taken of the fact that differencing algorithms are well known in the art as a way of compressing data streams in wireless systems.
- 37. Regarding claim 30, Ammons teaches the step of processing data in accordance with feed type from said information source (pp. 2-4 data groups as feed types).
- 38. Regarding claim 31, Ammons teaches a method wherein said feed type comprises binary type feeds (p. 2 RBDS signal).

Art Unit: 2154

39. Regarding claim 32, McCoy teaches a method wherein said feed type comprises common user information type fields (Col. 2 lines 14-20).

- 40. Regarding claim 33, Ammons teaches a system wherein said feed type comprises feeds for modifying registry keys which control processing of data (Ammons p. 11 new uses for groups 5, 6, and 7).
- 41. Regarding claim 34, McCoy teaches a method further comprising the step of using tags to differentiate types of information (Col. 4 lines 29-50).
- 42. Regarding claim 35, McCoy teaches a method further comprising the step of instantaneously alerting said user to personal alerts through the use of sound, graphics, bit maps or video, wherein said user can instantaneously access information (Col. 14 line 56 to Col. 15 line 13).
- 43. Regarding claim 36, McCoy teaches a method further comprising the step of encoding said data with information relating to message parameters for filtering (Col. 14 lines 56-67 paging code as filtering parameter).
- 44. Regarding claim 44, Ammons teaches the step of modifying said preprocessed data instantaneously and wirelessly (p. 2 adding RBDS subcarrier to FM stereo program).

Art Unit: 2154

- 45. Regarding claim 49, McCoy teaches a method wherein said information source may be an Internet access provider providing data feeds (Col. 2 lines 1-13; Col. 13 line 66 to Col. 14 line 4).
- 46. Regarding claim 50, McCoy teaches a method wherein said information source may be an on-line service provider providing data feeds (Col. 2 lines 1-13; Col. 13 line 66 to Col. 14 line 4).
- 47. Regarding claim 60, McCoy teaches a method comprising transmitting said preprocessed data utilizing a FM subcarrier, digital, analog, cellular, GSM or PCS carrier (Col. 2 lines 24-39).

Claims 161-178:

48. Regarding claims 161-178, they are broader method claims addressed to essentially the same subject matter as the claims discussed above and are rejected for under the same basis.

'958 v. Ammons and '721 and '338

49. Claims 4-6, 67-69, 85-87, and 144-146 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCoy in view of Ammon and May and Schwob, U.S. Patent No. 5,732,338. Since claims 85-87 and 144-146 are duplicate claims as discussed above, separate reasons for rejection will not be given.

Serial Number: 09/350,467 13
Art Unit: 2154

Claims 67-69:

- 50. Regarding claim 67, the combination of McCoy in view of Ammons and Lee teaches the invention substantially as claimed. See section 14 for the rejection of parent claim 65. The combination of McCoy in view of Ammons and Lee does not teach the additional limitation of claim 67. Schwob on the other hand discloses a system wherein preprocessed data is transmitted utilizing a vertical blanking interval (Col. 3 lines 8-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of McCoy in view of Ammons in Lee by substituting Schwob's VBI transmission scheme for the FM subcarrier transmission scheme of the combination. This modification would have been obvious given Schwob's teaching that FM subcarrier and VBI transmission schemes are alternate ways of broadcasting data (Cols. 2-3).
- 51. Regarding claim 68, Schwob teaches means for transmitting said preprocessed data using a satellite system (Col. 2 lines 56-62).
- 52. Regarding claim 69, Schwob teaches means for transmitting said preprocessed data to remote receivers by wired transmission (Col. 2 lines 56-62).

Claims 4-6:

Art Unit: 2154

53. Regarding claims 4-6, they are method claims corresponding to apparatus claims 67-69, respectively. Since they do not teach or define above the information in the corresponding apparatus claims, they are rejected under the same basis.

'958 v. Ammons and '721 and '338 and '415 and 652

54. Claims 7-13, 59, 70-77, 88-95, 136, and 147-154 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCoy in view of Ammons and May and Rossman, U.S. Patent No. 5,809,415, and Jacobson, U.S. Patent No. 5,442,652. Since claims 88-95, 136, and 147-154 are duplicate claims as discussed above, separate reasons for rejection will not be given.

Claims 70-77:

- 55. Regarding claim 70, the combination of McCoy in view of Ammons and Lee teaches the invention substantially as claimed. See section 8 for the rejection of parent claim 64.
- 56. The combination of McCoy in view of Ammons and Lee does not teach the additional limitation of claim 70.
- 57. Rossman on the other hand discloses a system further comprising means for attaching to said preprocessed data an Internet address location of said preprocessed data (Col. 6).
- 58. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Rossman's system for attaching a resource locator to a paging message with

Art Unit: 2154

the paging system of the combination of McCoy in view of Ammons and May. This combination would have been obvious because a person of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that downloading a message including a locator for a much larger object and subsequently retrieving the larger object through a higher bandwidth channel conserves the limited bandwidth of the FM subcarrier channel.

- 59. Jacobson on the other hand discloses means for providing said user with an automatic connection back to said information source for obtaining further information related to said preprocessed data (Col. 1 lines 23-38 response via dedicated telephone line). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Jacobson's return communication path via telephone line with the paging system of the combination of McCoy in view of Ammons and May. This combination would have been obvious because a person of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that downloading a message including a locator for a much larger object and subsequently retrieving the larger object through a higher bandwidth channel conserves the limited bandwidth of the FM subcarrier channel.
- 60. Regarding claim 71, Rossman teaches a system wherein said Internet address location is a URL (Cols. 23 & 38).

Art Unit: 2154

61. Regarding claim 72, Rossman teaches means for providing an automatic connection back to said information source through a user activating a single function on said computing device (Cols. 12-13).

- 62. Regarding claim 73, Rossman teaches a system wherein said single function comprises a single click on said computing device (Cols. 12-13).
- 63. Regarding claim 74, Jacobson teaches a system wherein said connection back to said information source is an automated wired connection (Col. 1 lines 23-38 response via dedicated telephone line).
- 64. Regarding claim 75, Rossman teaches a system wherein said connection back to said information source is an automated wireless connection (Cols. 11-14).
- 65. Regarding claim 76, Rossman teaches means for determining, attaching, transmitting, extracting, and displaying (Cols. 11-14).
- 66. Regarding claim 77, Rossman teaches means for launching an Internet browser and passing said Internet address location to said browser for automatic connection back to said information source (Cols. 11-14).

Claims 7-13 and 58-59:

Art Unit: 2154

67. Regarding claims 7-13, they are method claims corresponding to apparatus claims 70-77. Since they do not teach or define above the information in the corresponding apparatus claims, they are rejected under the same basis. The claims correspond as follows: 7 with 70, 8 with 71, 9 with 72, second claim 9 with 73, 10 with 74, 11 with 75, 12 with 76, 13 with 77.

Ammons and Lee teaches the invention substantially as claimed.

See section 8 for the rejection of parent claim 1. The combination of McCoy in view of Ammons and Lee does not teach the additional limitation of claim 58. Rossman on the other hand discloses a method further comprising attaching to said preprocessed data an Internet address location of said preprocessed data for providing to said user a message that causes a process or transaction on said computing device to occur (Cols. 11-14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Rossman's system for attaching a resource locator to preprocessed data with the system of the combination of McCoy in view of Ammons and May for the reasons given in the rejection of claim 70.

Art Unit: 2154

69. Regarding claim 59, Rossman teaches a system wherein said

Internet address is a proprietary on-line addressing scheme

(Cols. 19-20 network translator).

'958 v. Ammons and '721 and Beam

70. Claims 37-43, 45-48, 56-57, 119-125, 127-130, and 133-134 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCoy in view of Ammons and May and Beam, M., "A Summary of Broadcasting Technologies and Potential Applications in Today's Market," http://www.dungeon.com/~start/rds_0030.html, pp. 1-8, 1994. Since claims 19-125, 127-130, and 133-134 are duplicate claims as discussed above, separate reasons for rejection will not be given.

Claims 37-48:

- 71. Regarding claim 37, McCoy teaches the invention substantially as claimed. See section 20 for the rejection of claim 1. McCoy does not teach the additional limitations of claim 37.
- 72. Beam on the other hand discloses a method further comprising the steps of:
- a. Monitoring said transmissions using multiple viewers(p. 6);
 - b. Filtering said transmitted preprocessed data (p. 6);
 - c. Post processing said preprocessed data (p. 6);

Art Unit: 2154

- d. Notifying said user instantaneously of receipt of filtered postprocessed data (p. 6).
- 73. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Beam's method for delivering multiple services to a personal computer using a broadcast network with the data broadcast system of the combination of McCoy in view of Ammons and May. This combination would have been obvious of McCoy's explicit teaching to configure the radio data reception system to "accommodate a user and access only desired information" (Col. 14 lines 41-44).
- 74. Regarding claim 38, Beam teaches a method comprising filtering said transmitted preprocessed data in accordance with preferences set by said user (p. 6).
- 75. Regarding claim 39, Beam teaches a method comprising setting said preferences with respect to sound, video, and animation (p. 6).
- 76. Regarding claim 40, Beam teaches a method comprising filtering said preprocessed data in accordance with virtual addresses (p. 6).
- 77. Regarding claim 41, Beam teaches a method comprising filtering said preprocessed data in accordance with physical addresses (p. 6).

Art Unit: 2154

- 78. Regarding claim 42, Beam teaches the step of controlling said viewers from said central broadcast server (p. 6).
- 79. Regarding claim 43, Beam teaches the step of activating said preprocessed data at a scheduled time (p. 5).
- 80. Regarding claim 45, Beam teaches the step of activating services wirelessly through activation codes which enable or disable services (p. 6).
- 81. Regarding claim 46, Beam teaches the step of adding viewers from said central broadcast server (p. 6).
- 82. Regarding claim 47, Beam teaches the step of removing viewers from said central processing server (p. 6).
- 83. Regarding claim 48, McCoy teaches the step of recombining, decoding and decompressing said preprocessed data (Cols. 10-12).
- 84. Regarding claim 56, Beam teaches the step of displaying contextual graphics on said computing device to show data in a predefined format (p. 6).
- 85. Regarding claim 57, Beam teaches the step of claim 57 wherein said predefined format is a scoreboard (p. 6).

'958 v. Ammons and '721 and '302

86. Claims 26-28 and 108-110 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCoy in view of Ammon and May and Geiger, U.S. Patent No. 5,701,302. Since claims 108-110 are

Art Unit: 2154

duplicate claims as discussed above, separate reasons for rejection will not be given.

Claims 26-28:

- 87. Regarding claim 26, the combination of McCoy in view of Ammons and Lee teaches the invention substantially as claimed. See section 20 for the rejection of parent claim 1. The combination of McCoy in view of Ammons and Lee does not teach the additional limitation of claim 26. Geiger on the other hand discloses a system combining Huffman compression and the dictionary based compression based algorithms (Cols. 1-2; Col. 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Geiger's apparatus for compressing data with the FM subcarrier data broadcast system of the combination of McCoy in view of Ammons and May so as to transmit compressed data using the transparent data channel. This combination would have been obvious because using compression increases the effective bandwidth of the transparent data channel.
- 88. Regarding claim 27, Geiger teaches a method further comprising scanning input texts, searching for the next item, searching for the next item in a static Huffman dictionary, and choosing said search method which produces a better compression result (Cols. 5-7).

Art Unit: 2154

89. Regarding claim 28, Geiger teaches a method further comprising decompressing said compressed data (Fig. 8).

Double Patenting

90. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co., 151 U.S. 186 (1894); In re Ockert, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer <u>cannot</u> overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

- 91. Claims 51-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1, 2, and 75-77, respectively of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,021,433. This is a double patenting rejection.
- 92. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground

Art Unit: 2154

provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b). Claims 1-50 and 56-178 are rejected under the judicially 93. created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-50 and 56-81 of U.S. Patent No. 6,021,433. Claims 1-50 and 56-81 of this application are copies of the originially filed claims of the patent. The conflicting claims of the patent and this application are not identical in scope because the claims of the patent were narrowed during prosecution. When the narrower claims of the patent are used as a base reference for purposes of an obviousness type double patenting rejection, they teach every limitation of the corresponding claim in this application. The fact that the narrower patent claims teach more is irrelevant given the applicants use of the open ended transitional phrase "comprising". Regarding claims 82-103, they are method claims corresponding to claims 7-16, 73, and 78 of this applicationand are rejected for the same reasons. The claims correspond as follows: 82 with 7, 83 with 7, 84 with 7, 85 with 8, 86 with 9, 87 with 73, 89 with 10, 90 with 12, 91 with 7, 92 with 7, 93 with 12, 94 with 7, 95 with 12, 96 with 13, 97 with 8, 98 with 14, 99 with 78, 100 with 14, 101 with 15, 102 with 12, 103 with 16.

Art Unit: 2154

Since claims 82-159 are duplicate claims as discussed above, separate reasons for rejection will not be given. As to claim 160, it is rejected because, in this case, the difference between a computing device and a computer is not patentably distinct.

As to claims 161-178, they are broader versions of the claims discussed above and are obvious in view of claims 1-50 and 56-81 of U.S. Patent No. 6,021,433 for essentially the same reasons given above.

Conclusion

94. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Caldwell, whose telephone number is (703) 306-3036. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by phone fail, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An, can be reached at (703) 305-9678. Additionally, the fax numbers for Group 2100 are as follows:

Official Responses: (703) 746-7239 After Final Responses: (703) 746-7238 Draft Responses: (703) 746-7240

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist at (703) 305-3900.

Andrew Caldwell April 20, 2002

amorew Caldwell